REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following disclosure is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 are pending, each of the claims having been amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action the Abstract was objected to; and Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In reply the Abstract has been amended as requested.

Claims 1-7 have been amended to further clarify the claims and more completely explain the "evaluation value", consistent with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Moreover, an aspect of the present invention is that it identifies different representative pictures that are detected. The representative picture, are pictures within the video that serve as "landmarks" in the video stream for later allowing quick navigation through the video. When different representative picture candidates are detected, the process computes an evaluation value and records it on the recording medium (see, e.g., Figure 2, step S3).

The basis of the 112, first paragraph rejection is that "it is unclear how the evaluation values of the representative pictures are computed". However, as explained in the specification, (e.g. page 19, lines 6-8) the evaluation value represents the "degree of likeness" of the frames serving as the representative picture. A specific algorithm for determining the degree of likeness, is not the main feature of the invention. There are many known techniques for determining the degree of likeness between frames in a picture, such as discussed in the Assignee's Patent No. 6,101,222 (see, e.g., column 5, lines 51-53), which explain the use of correlation surfaces to determine comparison between different video images. Likewise the MPEG processing also determines the degree of change between

frames as measured by differential signal entropy (see, e.g., Table 6.2, page 119 of Haskell, B et al., Digital Video: An Introduction to MPEG-2, Chapman and Hall, 1997).

It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to use any one of a variety of different image processing techniques, such as motion estimation in MPEG-2, or correlation, as discussed in U.S. Patent No. 6,101,222 to quantify the degree of likeness in determining an evaluation value for a frame. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that it would not require undue experimentation in order to implement any particular type of degree of likeness test.

Each of the independent claims has been amended to more specifically describe that the evaluation is indicative of a degree of likeness of the representative picture to other representative pictures. Support is found at page 19, first paragraph, and therefore no new matter is added.

In view of the association between evaluation valve and its relationship to degree of likeness between frames, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-7 are enabled by the specification and otherwise comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. However, if the Examiner disagrees the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that mutually agreeable claim language may be identified.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing discussion, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-7 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and are otherwise in condition for formal examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,
OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\BDL\27s\275765US\275765US.AM1_032706.DOC